

**Remarks**

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 26, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended, and claims 10-11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that identifying each of the tagged data items includes calculating the distance between each search result and each tagged data item and determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text. The claims have further been amended to specify removing a tag from a displayed item associated with the one or more search results by specifying in the user interface that the item should not be categorized. Support for these amendments may be found on page 13, lines 10-27 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 6-22, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard (US 6,175,830) and Douglass et al. (US 2002/0040311, hereinafter “Douglass”) in view of Nasypny (US 2005/0071150). Claims 3-5 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny in view of Kadayam et al. (US 2003/0212673, hereinafter “Kadayam”).

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

**1, 2, 6-22, and 25-28**

Claims 1, 2, 6-22, and 25-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Maynard and Douglass in view of Nasypny. Claims 10-11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a computer-implemented method for displaying one or more tagged data items proximate to a result of a search of an electronic document. The method includes locating one or more of the search results generated by the search of the electronic document; identifying each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document within a distance from each search result using a proximity rule, wherein identifying each of the tagged data items comprises: calculating the distance between each search result and each tagged data item; and determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text; determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence; and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose identifying each of the tagged data items by determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text.

Maynard discusses an information management retrieval and display system for searching through an informational resource, such as a document, a number of individual documents, or a stream of information and for displaying the results of the search in a collapsible/expandable format based upon a user-selected display criteria or hierarchy. (See Maynard column 5, lines 42-52.) A hierarchy selection, of Maynard, informs a search module of the type of display format that a user wishes to see the results displayed. (See Maynard column

6, lines 46-48.) The hierarchy selection, of Maynard, will inform the search module whether or not the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based entirely upon the information contained within the categorical tags (research-centric), if the search results are to be displayed in an order depending entirely upon the frequency of the key words or phrases present within the finite elements (conventional), or if the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based upon a combination of the two (document-centric). (See Maynard column 6, lines 48-57.) Maynard further discusses a break module which parses through the informational resource to break up the resource (e.g., a group of documents) into finite elements. As discussed in Maynard, each finite element is usually not a single word, phrase or symbol, but is a section or portion of the resource that can be identified and isolated by the break module such as individual document paragraphs, sub-chapters of a document, individual pages of a document, and other types of identifiable sections of a document or the entire document itself. (See Maynard column 6, lines 1-14).

As conceded in the Office Action, Maynard fails to teach identifying each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document within a distance from each search result using a proximity rule or determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence. Thus, Maynard also fails to teach or suggest identifying each of the tagged data items by determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text. In contrast, Maynard discusses parsing through finite elements which do not include single words, phrases or symbols but instead include identifiable document sections such as individual paragraphs, sub-chapters, and pages. It is respectfully submitted that a predetermined number of lines of text, as recited in

amended claim 1, may include the single words or phrases which Maynard specifically identifies as not being covered by the finite elements. In other words, a predetermined number of lines of text in a document does not represent an identifiable document section as required by Maynard.

Douglass, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Maynard, discusses a computer-readable medium is provided which automatically rates web pages 12 based on pre-designated, project-based keywords 14 during research in which results are saved in association with a project 20. (See Douglass paragraph [0018].) Douglass also discusses a computer processor (on a PC on which the software is running) that applies calculation logic stored in a method 10 to automatically calculate statistics and/or relevancy ratings 24 based on keywords 14 found in the document 12 (using algorithms for frequency, location, density, proximity, Autorank and matches, for example). (See Douglass paragraph [0020].)

As conceded in the Office Action, Douglass fails to teach determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence. Douglass also fails to teach or suggest identifying each of the tagged data items by determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text. In contrast, Douglass fails to discuss a scanning for words matching keywords stored in a library to calculate statistics or relevancy ratings using, for example, a proximity algorithm (Douglass paragraph [0020]). This discussion however, is not the same as a proximity rule having a distance criterion which is a predetermined number of lines of text. In particular, Douglass utilized a proximity algorithm to calculate statistics or relevancy rating in matching keywords while amended claim 1 specifies a proximity rule based on a calculated physical

distance between a search result and tagged data items in an electronic document using a criterion which is a predetermined number of lines of text.

Nasypny, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Maynard and Douglass, discusses extracting knowledge from textual documents of search systems. A self-learning mechanism in a form of a stochastically indexed artificial intelligence system is provided which carries out a morphological analysis and a stochastic indexing of linguistic documents and carries out a semantic analysis of stochastically indexed textual documents pertaining to a given theme. Nasypny further discusses carrying out a preliminary selection of stochastically indexed fragments of textual documents comprising all word combinations of user requests, providing a link between stochastically indexed fragments of textual documents, and checking a relevancy of a brief reply to the user's request by generating an interrogative sentence from the brief reply and comparing the sentence with the user's request. (See Nasypny, paragraphs [0023] - [0035].)

Nasypny fails to teach or suggest at least identifying each of the tagged data items by determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text. In contrast, Nasypny discusses a self-learning system for extracting fragments from text documents and generating an interrogative statement which is compared to a user request to determine a match. Thus, Nasypny fails to disclose identifying tagged data items or determining if a calculated distance is less than a distance is less than a distance criterion as specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 6-13 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 14 and 20 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and are thus allowable over the combination of Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Additionally, amended claim 20 further specifies removing a tag from a displayed item associated with the one or more search results by specifying in the user interface that the item should not be categorized. While Maynard discusses the display of search results (See Maynard column 6, lines 48-57), the reference fails to teach or suggest a user interface for removing a tag from a displayed item associated with one or more search results to indicate that the item should no longer be categorized. Douglass discusses the manual viewing of the contents of a web page (see Douglass Abstract) but also fails to teach or suggest a user interface for removing a tag from a displayed item associated with one or more search results to indicate that the item should no longer be categorized. Nasypny merely discusses generating a reply to a user request which is utilized in determining a match See Nasypny, paragraphs [0023] - [0035] and thus also fails to teach or suggest a user interface for removing a tag from a displayed item associated with one or more search results to indicate that the item should no longer be categorized. Therefore, amended claim 20 is also allowable for at least the foregoing additional reasons.

Claims 15-19, 21, and 25-28 depend from amended claims 14 and 20, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 23-24

Claims 3-5 and 23-24 are rejected being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny in view of Kadayam. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 and 23-24 depend from amended claims 1 and 20, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, these claims are allowable over the combination of Maynard, Douglass and Nasypny for at least the same reasons. Kadayam, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of the aforementioned combination, discusses an enterprise-scale system and method for searching and retrieving electronic information from disparate electronic information sources within a large organization (an intranet) and/or from the Internet. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].) Kadayam discusses a "federated search" architecture and system that enables a single search query from a user to be delivered in real-time to various selected islands of information. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].) The system of Kadayam can collate results, removes duplicates and dead-links, apply composite relevance scoring, and deliver the relevant results to the user. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].)

Kadayam fails to teach or suggest determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result, as recited in claims 3-5 and 23-24. While Kadayam may mention using an intelligent source selection function, Kadayam merely utilizes the intelligent source selection to provide a sub-set of information sources to perform a search, and fails to use semantic intelligence to determine whether one or more tagged items should be associated with a search result. (See Kadayam paragraph [0053].) Kadayam is merely directed to the retrieval and organization of information from a plurality of information sources, not extracting information associated with a search term.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Maynard, Douglass, Nasypny, and Kadayam fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 3-5 and 23-24. Therefore, these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(404) 954-5100

Date: January 28, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/  
Alton Hornsby III  
Reg. No. 47,299

